

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-16 are all the claims pending in the application.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to by the Examiner as allegedly failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) “because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 4c, 22c, 1e, and 35,” (Office Action, page 2).

Applicant respectfully submits that at least Fig. 5 includes the reference signs 4c and 22c mentioned in the specification, and at least Fig. 8 includes the reference signs 1e and 35 mentioned in the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 11 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (U.S. Patent No. 6,359,370) in view of Bullock (U.S. Patent No. 4,140,936). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Bullock and Sasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,067,965; hereinafter “Sasaki”). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Bullock and Toki (U.S. Patent No. 5,856,956; hereinafter “Toki”). Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Bullock and Ogura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,050; hereinafter “Ogura”). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to partially recite the subject matter of claim 14. Specifically, claim 1 as amended recites a piezo-electric actuator comprising, *inter alia*:

“a plurality of beam members each having both ends that are fixed to the constraint member and the supporting member, respectively, wherein each beam member has a neutral axis for bending in a direction substantially parallel with the constrained surface,

wherein said beam members are made of resin”.

The Examiner acknowledges that Chang fails to teach or suggest a plurality of beam members made of resin, and instead relies on Bullock. However, Bullock discloses that hinges 7 and 8 (allegedly corresponding to the claimed beam members) are “end portions of the plate [3, which] are reduced in thickness to form, in effect, hinges 7 and 8,” (Bullock: col. 3, lines 43-45). Bullock further discloses that the metal support plate 3 is formed of “aluminum, brass or steel,” (col. 3, lines 35-36). Clearly, Bullock does not teach or suggest the claimed feature of “wherein said beam members are made of resin,” and fails to address the deficiencies of Chang.

Neither Sasaki, Toki nor Ogura address the above-identified deficiencies of Chang and Bullock.

Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Applicant further submits that claims 3-13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/562,578

Attorney Docket No.: Q92252

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Rohit K. Krishna /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Rohit K. Krishna
Registration No. 62,474

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 23, 2009